



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,831	04/24/2006	Tae Il Kim	4883-3	4835
23117 7590 06/27/2008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
SHEDRICK, CHARLES TERRELL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/27/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/576,831

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

CHARLES SHEDRICK

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 10-12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Ito US Patent No.: 6,108,856**.

Consider **claims 1, 10-12**, Ito teaches a system and method of determining a position of a mobile communication device in a mobile communication network including a plurality of base stations, comprising the steps of: dividing an area covered by the mobile communication network into a plurality of grids and collecting a first base station signal information with respect to each of the divided grids (e.g., see **abstract, col. 3 lines 40-43, col. 5 lines 55-60, col. 6 lines 1-15 and col. 10 lines 42-59 and figure 1**); storing and maintaining the collected first base station signal information in association with position information of the grids in a database (e.g., **col. 1 lines 34-58, col. 3 lines 11-24, col. 4 lines 20-22, col. 6 lines 54-col. 7 line 4**); measuring a second base station signal information received by the mobile communication device (**col. 3 lines 39-56, col. 4 lines 31-36, col. 5 line 61 – col. 6 line 5, and col. 7 line 40-col. 8 line 7**); comparing the second base station signal information with the first base station signal information to find position information corresponding to the second base station signal information in the database(**col. 6 lines 11-15 and col. 8 lines 11-12**); and generating final position information of the mobile communication device based on the position information

found in the database (e.g., see abstract, col. 3 lines 54-55, col. 4 lines 50-58 and col. 8 lines 23-25 and claim 1).

Consider **Claim 5 and as applied to claim 1**, Ito teaches the claimed invention further comprising the steps of: determining second position information by a predetermined second position determination method (e.g., see figure 6 and col. 10 lines 22-49); measuring third base station signal information received by a second mobile communication device with respect to the second position information(e.g., see figure 6 and col. 10 lines 22-49); and updating the first base station signal information stored in the database based on the measured third base station signal information(e.g., see figure 6 and col. 10 lines 22-49).

Consider **claim 12 and as applied to claim 11**, Ito teaches wherein the position determination unit is installed in the mobile communication device (i.e., the unit inherently needed for the mobile station to check it's own position as noted in col. 8 line 32).

Consider **claim 18**, Ito teaches a computer readable recording medium in which a program for executing the method of claim 1 is recorded (i.e., the programmable hardware of the system)(col. 2 lines 63-65)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims **3, 8-9, 13 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ito US Patent No.: 6,108,856 in view of Kimura et al. US Patent Pub. No.: 2003/0143994 A1, hereinafter, "Kimura"**

Consider **claims 13 and 17**, Ito teaches a method of determining a position of a region name or lot number to which a mobile communication device belongs (e.g., see **col. 4 lines 50-58**), comprising the steps of: collecting first base station signal information with respect to each region name or lot number(e.g., see **abstract, col. 3 lines 40-43, col. 5 lines 55-60, col. 6 lines 1-15 and col. 10 lines 42-59 and figure 1**); storing and maintaining the collected first base station signal information in association with identification information of the region name or lot

number in a pattern matching database(e.g., col. 1 lines 34-58, col. 3 lines 11-24, col. 4 lines 20-22, col. 6 lines 54-col. 7 line 4)(i.e., based on a characteristic signal); measuring second base station signal information received by the mobile communication device(col. 3 lines 39-56, col. 4 lines 31-36, col. 5 line 61 – col. 6 line 5, and col. 7 line 40-col. 8 line 7); searching the pattern matching database by the second base station signal information to find a base station set similar to the second base station signal information(e.g., see at least col. 6 lines 10-15, and claims 1-3); and determining a position of a region name or lot number corresponding to the found base station set as the position of the a region name or lot number to which the mobile communication device belongs in the case the property of the second base station signal information is corresponding to a predetermined property range of the found base station set(e.g., see abstract, col. 3 lines 54-55, col. 4 lines 50-58 and col. 8 lines 23-25 and claim 1).

However, Ito does not specifically teach a position of a Building.

In analogous art, Kimura teaches determining a building location (e.g., see at least paragraph 0235).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito to include determining the location of a building for the purpose of determining the location of user in the building as taught by Kimura.

Consider **claim 3 and as applied to claim 1**, Ito teaches the claimed invention except wherein the grids are three-dimensionally divided, the position information includes altitude information, and the first base station signal information varies with the altitude information. However, in analogous art, Kimura teaches three-dimensionally, the position information includes altitude information, and the first base station signal information varies with the altitude

information (e.g., see **paragraph 0235**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito to include the grids are three-dimensionally divided, the position information includes altitude information, and the first base station signal information varies with the altitude information for the purpose of determining the location of user in the building as taught by Kimura.

Consider **claims 8 and 9 as applied to claim 1**, Ito teaches the claimed invention except wherein the grids are divided according to the inside and outside of a building and a story of the building.

However, in analogous art, Kimura teaches wherein the grids are divided according to the inside and outside of a building and a story of the building (e.g., see **paragraph 0235**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito to include wherein the grids are divided according to the inside and outside of a building and a story of the building for the purpose of determining the location of user in the building as taught by Kimura.

Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ito US Patent No.: 6,108,856 in view of Hunzinger US Patent Pub. No.: 2002/0025822**.

Consider **claim 2 and as applied to claim 1**, Ito teaches the claimed invention except wherein the first base station signal information includes at least one of pseudo-random noise phase, pseudo-random noise offset, pseudo-random noise phase delay, and pseudo-random noise strength.

However, in analogous art, Hunzinger teaches wherein the first base station signal information includes at least one of pseudo-random noise phase, pseudo-random noise offset, pseudo-random noise phase delay, and pseudo-random noise strength (e.g., see at least **abstract and paragraph 0005**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito to include wherein the first base station signal information includes at least one of pseudo-random noise phase, pseudo-random noise offset, pseudo-random noise phase delay, and pseudo-random noise strength for the purpose of determining position information as taught by Hunzinger.

Consider **claim 6 and as applied to claim 5**, Ito teaches the claimed invention except wherein the second position determination method is performed by a GPS receiving device.

However, in analogous art, Hunzinger teaches GPS (e.g., see at least **paragraph 0017**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito to include GPS for the purpose of determining position information as taught by Hunzinger.

Claims **4, 14-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ito US Patent No.: 6,108,856 in view of Kimura et al. US Patent Pub. No.: 2003/0143994 A1, hereinafter, “Kimura” and further in view of Hunzinger US Patent Pub. No.: 2002/0025822.**

Consider **claim 4 and as applied to claim 3**, Ito as modified by Kimura teaches the claimed invention except wherein the altitude information is determined based on relative phase difference of the pseudo-random noise offsets with respect to the plurality of base stations.

However, in analogous art, Hunzinger teaches relative phase difference of the pseudo-

random noise offsets with respect to the plurality of base stations (e.g., see at least **abstract and paragraphs 0005 and 0018-0020**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito as modified by Kimura to include relative phase difference of the pseudo-random noise offsets with respect to the plurality of base stations for the purpose of determining position information as taught by Hunzinger.

Consider **claim 14 and as applied to claim 13**, Ito as modified by Kimura teaches the claimed invention except wherein the predetermined property range of the base station set includes a pseudo-random noise phase delay range and a pseudo-random noise strength range.

However, in analogous art, Hunzinger teaches wherein the predetermined property range of the base station set includes a pseudo-random noise phase delay range and a pseudo-random noise strength range (e.g., see at least **abstract and paragraphs 0005 and 0018-0020**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito as modified by Kimura to include wherein the predetermined property range of the base station set includes a pseudo-random noise phase delay range and a pseudo-random noise strength range for the purpose of determining position information as taught by Hunzinger.

Consider **claim 15 and as applied to claim 14**, Ito as modified by Kimura teaches the claimed invention except wherein: the pseudo-random noise phase delay range is determined within a predetermined range including a minimum value and a maximum value of the pseudo-random noise phase delays of base stations in the base station set, and the pseudo-random noise strength is determined within a predetermined range including a minimum value and a maximum

value of the pseudo-random noise strengths of base stations in the base station set.

However, in analogous art, Hunzinger teaches wherein: the pseudo-random noise phase delay range is determined within a predetermined range including a minimum value and a maximum value of the pseudo-random noise phase delays of base stations in the base station set(e.g., see at least abstract and paragraphs 0005 and 0018-0020), and the pseudo-random noise strength is determined within a predetermined range including a minimum value and a maximum value of the pseudo-random noise strengths of base stations in the base station set(e.g., see at least abstract and paragraphs 0005 and 0018-0020).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ito as modified by Kimura to include wherein: the pseudo-random noise phase delay range is determined within a predetermined range including a minimum value and a maximum value of the pseudo-random noise phase delays of base stations in the base station set, and the pseudo-random noise strength is determined within a predetermined range including a minimum value and a maximum value of the pseudo-random noise strengths of base stations in the base station set for the purpose of determining position

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 7 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLES SHEDRICK whose telephone number is (571)272-8621. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harper Paul can be reached on (571)-272-7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VINCENT P. HARPER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles Shedrick/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617
June 19, 2008

